

# Planning and Development Control Committee Minutes

Tuesday 6 February 2018

## PRESENT

**Committee members:** Councillors Adam Connell (Chair), Iain Cassidy (Vice-Chair), Colin Aherne, Michael Cartwright, Wesley Harcourt, Natalia Perez, Jacqueline Borland, Lucy Ivimy, Alex Karmel and Viya Nsumbu.

**Others:** Councillor Harry Phibbs

### 1. MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2018 were agreed as an accurate record.

### 2. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

There were no apologies for absence.

### 3 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

Councillor Alex Karmel declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as he had friends which lived at Stamford Bridge Arches. He had not discussed the application with them. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Lucy Ivimy declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew a number of the objectors and had met with local residents. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Jacqueline Borland declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew a number of the objectors but had not discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Viya Nsumbu declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew a number of the objectors but had not discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

**4 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches, Ravenscourt Place, London W6 0UQ, Ravenscourt Park 2017/03835/FUL**

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which made minor changes to the report.

Councillor Alex Karmel declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as he had friends which lived at Stamford Bridge Arches. He had not discussed the application with them. He remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Lucy Ivimy declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew a number of the objectors and had met with local residents. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Jacqueline Borland declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew a number of the objectors but had not discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

Councillor Viya Nsumbu declared a non-pecuniary interest in respect of 101 And 105 - 107 Stamford Brook Arches as she knew a number of the objectors but had not discussed the application. She remained in the meeting, participated and voted on the item.

The Committee heard a representation in objection to the application from a local resident. Some of the points raised included: the officer report did not reflect the position of the objectors fairly and the conditions within the report were not specific enough to be enforceable. Residents disagreed that the location was suitable for a sporting facility. Factors such as increased footfall, privacy / overlooking and traffic impacts had not been properly considered. Residents felt the proposed entrance on the cul de sac on Ravenscourt Place would be detrimental as it would cause, noise, nuisance and disturbance. The proposal was located in a conservation area and data provided by the Applicant in support of the proposal, was flawed, as the Vauxhall Bridge location was dissimilar to the proposed residential location.

The Committee heard a representation in support of the application by the Applicant. Some of the points raised included: Climbing was a benefit to people's lives. No alcohol or anti-social behaviour would be generated by the application and members would only enter the site in small groups. As the proposal was situated in close proximity to Ravenscourt Park Tube Station, the majority of members would use the public transport and so there would be minimal traffic impact. Climbing was not a noisy activity and loud music would not be played on the site. Every customer would provide full details on registration which would be

held on a database. This would dissuade anti-social behaviour. The proposal incorporated comprehensive CCTV coverage of all access and egress points.

Councillor Harry Phibbs spoke as ward Councillor for Ravenscourt Park. Some of the points raised included: the Committee had a responsibility to consider whether or not an application would enhance or preserve the conservation area. The suitability of the proposed location was questionable and was very different to the Applicants' business at Vauxhall Bridge. The proposed hours of operation were unreasonable and not compatible with a residential area. The possible impacts associated with the proposed café and likelihood of the site becoming a social venture. The proposed access to the site was detrimental to the local area and using Ravenscourt Road would mitigate the impact on local residents. He hoped the application was not accepted as presented and asked that the Applicant was encouraged to resubmit the application with revised proposals.

The Committee considered the proposed hours of operation, club membership / registration and the impact on local residents. In the course of discussions, Councillor Lucy Ivimy proposed that should the application be approved, condition 7, related to the hours of operation be varied to 9 am to 9 pm. This was seconded by Councillor Alex Karmel.

The Committee discussed access and egress to the site and on balance felt that if this were changed from Ravenscourt Place to Ravenscourt Road, many of the objections which had been raised would be met. Councillor Lucy Ivimy proposed that the application be deferred. This was seconded by Councillor Colin Aherne. Officers were asked to have further discussions with the Applicant about the proposed entrance to the site, the hours of operation and to review community usage and the membership scheme.

The Committee voted on application 2017/03835/FUL and whether to defer the item to a future Committee meeting. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:  
10  
Against:  
0  
Not Voting:  
0

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2017/03835/FUL be deferred to a future Committee meeting.

**Lavender Court 168 -178 Westway And Existing Play Area on Joslings Close, London, Wormholt And White City 2017/04315/FUL**

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

In the course of discussions, the Committee discussed the removal of trees / landscaping, the use of blue roofs and the height of proposal. Further topics included the proximity of the highway and impact of vehicular pollutants in relation to the play space. The Committee also considered parking stress and the London wide assumption to restrict access to parking permits. Councillor Karmel proposed that access to parking permits should not be restricted for the scheme. This proposal was put to the vote and the result was as follows.

For:  
4  
Against:  
6  
Not Voting:  
0

Councillor Aherne requested that his vote against the proposal be formally recorded in the minutes.

The Committee voted on application 2017/04315/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation of approval and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:  
10  
Against:  
0  
Not Voting:  
0

#### **RESOLVED THAT:**

That application 2017/04315/FUL be approved for the reasons set out in the report and addendum.

#### **160 – 164 Hurlingham Road, London SW6 3NG, Parsons Green And Walham 2017/04609/FUL**

Please see the Addendum attached to the minutes which amended the report.

Introducing the report, Officers confirmed that a late representation had been received but no new material points had been raised.

The Committee heard a representation in support from the Architect. Some of the points raised included: the proposal had been developed in partnership with the Council. The amended design addressed the three previous reasons for refusal, namely: bulk and height, traffic impact and included the removal of the café and previously proposed roof terraces.

The Committee agreed that considerable steps had been taken by the Applicant to address the previous reasons for refusal.

The Committee voted on application 2017/04609/FUL and whether to agree the officer recommendation set out in the report and the changes set out in the addendum. This was put to the vote and the result was as follows:

For:  
7  
Against:  
0  
Not Voting:  
2

**RESOLVED THAT:**

That in relation to application 2017/04609/FUL:

- 1) That the Committee resolve that the Lead Director for Regeneration, Planning and Housing Services be authorised to determine the application and grant permission upon the completion of a satisfactory legal agreement and subject to the conditions listed in the report.
- 2) To authorise the Director for Regeneration, Planning and Housing Services after consultation with the Director of Law and the Chair of the Planning and Development Control Committee to make any minor changes to the proposed conditions or heads of terms of the legal agreement, any such changes shall be within their discretion.

Meeting started: 7:00 pm  
8:57 pm

Chair .....

Contact officer: Charles Francis  
Committee Co-ordinator  
Governance and Scrutiny  
Tel 020 8753 2062  
E-mail: charles.francis@lbhf.gov.uk